There being no objection, the supporting paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKGROUND

In a series of historic decisions, the Supreme Court on June 15, 1964, announced a rule of practical equality in legislative representation. *Reynolds* v. *Simms*, 84 Sup. Ct. 1362; *WMCA, Inc.* v. *Lomenzo*, 84 Sup. Ct. 1418; *Maryland Committee for Fair Representation* v. *Tawes*, 84 Sup. Ct. 1442; *Davis* v. *Mann*, 84 Sup. Ct. 1453; *Roman* v. *Sincock*, 84 Sup. Ct. 1462; *Lucas* v. *44th Gen. Assembly of the State of Colorado*, 84 Sup. Ct. 1472. These decisions elaborated upon and extended earlier decisions in which the Court had held that a complaint alleging "invidious discrimination in voting patterns" stated a claim for relief, *Baker* v. *Carr*, 82 Sup. Ct. 691, and held that the "equal protection clause" of the 14th amendment and the concept of "we the people" prohibits preferred voter classes and enjoins the use of a "one man, one vote" system in voting for candidates in a statewide election, *Gray* v. *Sanders*, 83 Sup. Ct. 801 (1963). In a related case the Court, construing article 1, of section 2 of the U.S. Constitution, and its requirement that representatives be chosen "by the people" has held that a "one man, one vote" rule is required in congressional elections. *Wesberry* v. *Sanders*, 84 Sup. Ct. 526 (1964).

The apportionment cases rest their weight upon the "equal protection clause" of the 14th amendment. Though mathematical exactness is not required, the equal-population principle becomes a well nigh exclusive criteria for apportionment:

"Neither history alone, nor economic or other sorts of group interests, are permissible factors in attempting to justify disparities from population-based representation. Considerations of area alone provide an insufficient justification for deviations from the equal population principle * * * if, even as a result of a clearly rational State policy of according some representation to political subdivisions, population is submerged as the controlling consideration in the apportionment of seats in a particular legislative body, then the right of all of the State's citizens * * * would be unconstitutionally impaired" (84 Sup. Ct. 1362, 1390–1392).

The Court rejected the Federal analogy and disregarded the expressed opinion of the people of the State of Colorado who had, by a 2-to-1 margin approved an apportionment scheme based on area representation and at the same time rejected a scheme based entirely upon population. *Lucas* v. *44th Gen. Assembly, State of Colorado, supra*. In substance, any deviation from the one man-one vote pattern will be viewed scrupulously with an apparent presumption against its constitutionality.

EXPLANATION

The words "any State" introduce departure from the restrictions of the equal protection clause announced in the apportionment cases. These words do not include territories, trust territories, or other areas under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. The 15th and 19th amendments separate the "United States" and "any State"; the 21st amendment, to reach beyond States, uses broadly inclusive language, "State, territory, or possession of the United States"; the 23d amendment was necessary to extend representation in presidential elections to the District of Columbia. Case law supports the conclusion of exclusion. *Metropolitan Railroad Co.* v. *District of Columbia*, 10 Sup. Ct. 19 (1889); *Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association* v. *Dailey*, 75 Fed. Supp. 832 (1948). If extension to nonstates is intended, the introductory words should be "any State, territory or possession of the United States."

The limitation to "any State having a legislature composed of more than one house" is designed to insure that any unicameral legislature will continue to be apportioned according to the one man-one vote principle. Constitutional principles announced in those cases and other sections of the Constitution would constitute a necessary limitation upon the power of the States.

The term "principle of equal representation" is designed to express the rule of "one man—one vote" with its limited qualifications. The term has been construed to require representation on a basis as near to equality of population as possible. *Donovan* v. *Suffolk County Apportionment Commissioners*, 113 N.E. 740 (1916); *Raglan* v. *Anderson*, 100 S.W. 865 (1907).

Limiting application of effect to "one house" insures that nonpopulation representation will be permissible in only one of the bodies; therefore permitting, among other plans, the so-called "Federal analogy" rejected by the Court in its decisions. At the present time this would permit the existence of one house in the legislature of all but one of our States, Nebraska, based upon nonpopulation factors. The intent is to limit the exception contained in this amendment to a single house.

Adoption of "another reasonable system" is designed to enunciate clearly a permissible departure from the system of equal population representation and at the same time insure that legislative action will follow nonarbitrary grounds and avoid the possibility of nonrational allocation of representation. The use of the word "reasonable" leaves to the courts the problem of determining legitimacy of State action within the range of this amendment and does not impose inflexible, blind rules upon determination of standards. The word, if this amendment were adopted, would have light shed upon it by the dissenting opinions of Justices Stewart and Clark in the apportionment cases. *WMCA, Inc.* v. *Lomenzo*, 84 Sup. Ct. 1418, 1429–1442. In this opinion, these Justices take the position that the Court should have followed the traditional rule in equal protection cases, which relied upon a reasonable basis or classification to establish legitimacy. In a clear enunciation of this doctrine, Justice Stewart states:

"Moving from the general to the specific, I think that the equal protection clause demands but two basic attributes of any plan of State legislative apportionment. First, it demands that, in the light of the States own characteristics and needs, the plan must be a rational one. Secondly, it demands that the plan must be such as not to permit the systematic frustration of the will of a majority of the electorate of the State. I think it is apparent that any plan of legislative apportionment which could be shown to reflect no policy, but simply arbitrary and capricious action or inaction, and that any plan which could be shown systematically to prevent ultimate effective majority rule, would be invalid under accepted equal protection clause standards. But, beyond this, I think there is nothing in the Federal Constitution to prevent a State from choosing any electoral legislative structure it thinks best suited to the interests, temper, and customs of its people" (84 Sup. Ct. 1418, 1434).

Though this amendment would limit reasoning embellishing the word "reasonable" to one house, the fact that majority wishes are respected by the last two clauses of the amendment and the word "reasonable" as used here should lead a court to this opinion for aid in construction of the word "reasonable".

It is intended to require that deviation be permitted only in the event it occurs as a result of a majority of the electors of the State voting in its favor. This is achieved by making departure dependent upon action by submitting the proposal to the electorate for majority approval. Electorate is defined as:

"The whole body of persons entitled to vote in an election, or any distinct class or division of them." Webster's New International Dictionary (1960) 825. "The whole body of electors." The Oxford Universal Dictionary (1955) 591.

The term "majority" means more than half. This is designed to insure that before any departure from the principle of "one man—one vote" is permitted, majority vote of the people affected by the apportionment occurs.

The provision is designed to insure that an easy method of reapproval of the system be provided.

CONDEMNATION OF THE SOVIET PERSECUTION OF JEWS AND ALL OTHER PERSONS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, for myself and 67 other Senators I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Soviet persecution of Jews and all other persons be condemned.

The concurrent resolution is similar to the one adopted by the Senate last year by a 60-to-1 vote as an amendment to the foreign aid bill. Unfortunately the amendment was stricken from the bill in conference. In its place the conferees substituted language condemning the "persecution of any persons because of their religion."

This is the compromise language I refused to accept on the floor of the Senate. The Senate sustained the original resolution by a 60-to-1 vote. Now I say Congress as a whole—the House and Senate acting together—should face this problem squarely and take a firm stand. I say Congress should condemn the intolerable conditions the Jewish people are enduring in the Soviet Union.

We must keep in mind that persecution of the Jews in the Soviet Union goes beyond simple religious persecution. In the Soviet Union the free exercise of religion in any meaningful sense has been denied to everyone. All religions exist precariously, to say the least, in an officially antireligious atmosphere. But in a variety of fundamental ways, Judaism is subject to unique discrimination.

Recent disclosures of continued persecution of persons of the Jewish faith in the Soviet Union make it clear beyond question that such activities are conducted with premeditated design as part of Soviet policy to discount obvious failures in that nation's social and economic structure. Religious persecution anywhere is bad enough, but when a nation uses it as an instrument of national policy it becomes reprehensible and should be condemned as such.

The main components of the Soviet policy against Jews are as follows:

First. The deprivation of cultural rights: Though the 3 million Soviet Jews are officially recognized as a nationality, they are the only nationality deprived of the basic cultural rights accorded to all the others—their own newspapers, for example, publishing houses, books, language, or theater.

Second. The deprivation of religious rights: Unlike all other religious denominations in the Soviet Union, Jewish congregations are not permitted to maintain nationwide federations or other central organizations. No Hebrew Bible has been published since 1917; there is an ex-

tion but not including printing, such sum as may be necessary.

The memorandum accompanying Senate Joint Resolution 40 is as follows:

BACKGROUND OF JOINT RESOLUTION TO PREPARE A REVISED EDITION OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 319

The subcommittee staff in 1961 began its preliminary research regarding the current legal status of Indian citizens under the U.S. Constitution. This undertaking involved an examination of the legislative, judicial, and administrative interpretations available on this subject.

The volumes entitled, "Indian Affairs, Laws and Treaties" (S. Doc. No. 319, 58th Cong.) proved to be an invaluable research tool despite the fact that the last volume was published in 1938. Recognizing the pressing need for a current compilation of these documents, the chairman of the Indian law committee of the Federal Bar Association recently called for an updating of these volumes.

Equally important in appraising the legal status of Indians are the opinions of the Solicitor of the Department of Interior which have the force and effect of law. As part I of the hearings clearly indicates, however, many of the opinions of the Solicitor have not been published and made available to those interested in Indian affairs.

In view of these facts, the subcommittee recommends that the Congress authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to—

1. Prepare an accurate compilation of all the Solicitor's opinions relating to Indian affairs; and

2. Prepare a revised edition of the documents entitled "Indian Affairs, Laws and Treaties."

BRIEF EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Section 1 authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to (a) revise and extend Senate Document No. 319, 58th Congress, to include all treaties, laws, Executive orders, regulations, and other pertinent matters relating to Indian affairs in force on July 1, 1964, and (b) to prepare an accurate compilation of all the Solicitor's opinions relating to Indian affairs.

Section 2 authorizes to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out the preparation, but not the printing, of such a compilation.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO APPORTIONMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, last year, in six extraordinary decisions, the Supreme Court declared that the Constitution required that both houses of State legislatures be apportioned on the basis of population. A scant 3 months later, the Senate was asked, in effect, to suspend the Constitution by postponing the implementation of the Court's decisions for up to 2 years. Last September 10, speaking of this proposal by Senator DIRKSEN, I said:

It is no answer to say that the rider will suspend the right to equal representation for a period of only 2 years. If we can cross this threshold, what is then to prevent us from extending the suspension for another 2 years, or for 5, or indefinitely. If this were to come to pass, the independence of our judiciary to give force and effect to the Constitution will be thoroughly undermined, and the checks and balances upon which our system of government has long rested, will be placed in the gravest jeopardy.

The Senate rejected the "Dirksen rider," refusing, by a vote of 63 to 30, to invoke cloture. A week later, in a series of votes, the Senate refused to endorse amendments to reverse the whole effect of all six court decisions. But is the matter to end there?

I should hope not. At the same time that I spoke in opposition to the "Dirksen rider" last year, I expressed the hope that the Supreme Court decisions could be modified by a constitutional amendment. I said:

I, myself, would prefer to leave the question of legislative apportionment to the people of each State, provided that the people themselves, in each case, are furnished with the opportunity to ratify their system by majority vote through a popular referendum. This would place the decision directly in the hands of the people, where sovereignty properly resides. I would support a constitutional amendment designed to accomplish this objective.

Today, Mr. President, I wish to propose such an amendment. It is one which acknowledges the sovereignty residing in the people of the States, while at the same time recognizing the right of every citizen to "equal protection of the law" under the 14th amendment.

The particular language of this proposed amendment is suggested by the professors of the School of Law at the University of Idaho, who have been working on it since last September, at my request. Dean Philip Peterson, assisted most closely by Professors Brockelbank, Bell, Berman, and Walenta of the law faculty, and Dr. Foy of the English faculty, worked intently and expertly on the amendment. I am grateful to them; and extend to them my sincere thanks for a public service well performed.

The significant portion of the amendment reads as follows:

Any State having a legislature composed of more than one house may depart from the principle of equal representation in one house by adopting another reasonable system of representation with the approval of a majority of the electorate, provided review be permitted periodically.

Mr. President, I send this amendment to the desk and ask that it be referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 37) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to permit membership in one house of a State legislature composed of more than one house to be apportioned with the approval of the electorate upon a system other than that of equal representation introduced by Mr. CHURCH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have also received a joint memorial which was recently passed by the Idaho State Legislature. It takes the form of an application, pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States, to the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution. The amendment which the Idaho Legislature endorses is very similar in objective to the one I have just introduced. Accordingly, I now send this proposed amendment to the desk, asking that it also be appropriately referred, and that the pertinent part be published at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the pertinent portion will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 38) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to permit membership in one house of a State legislature composed of more than one house to be apportioned with the approval of the electorate upon a system other than that of equal representation, introduced by Mr. CHURCH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The pertinent portion of the joint resolution presented by Mr. CHURCH is as follows:

ARTICLE —

SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which has a bicameral legislature from apportioning the numbers of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by Congress.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it will be noted that the amendment which the law faculty has prepared differs slightly from that proposed by the Idaho Legislature. The faculty version provides for popular review "periodically," while that of the legislature requires only one ratification by referendum without any continuing recourse to the people.

I have misgivings about the "one shot" approach. I think the right to popular review over a matter so fundamental should be left open. Populations will continue to shift, and so may voter opinion.

Nevertheless, I think that both the amendment endorsed by the Idaho State Legislature and that prepared by the faculty of the Idaho Law School, deserve the most careful consideration of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Both uphold the basic principle that the people of each State should be entitled to their sovereign right to determine the composition of their own legislature. I also believe strongly in the validity of this principle. And I shall work for the enactment of an amendment designed to accomplish this objective.

Mr. President, in connection with the amendment drafted by the faculty of the Idaho Law School, I call the Senate's attention to the fact that Dean Peterson and his associates have prepared a supporting paper, in which they first refer to the historic Supreme Court decisions giving rise to the proposed amendment, and then explain the reasons for the wording they have chosen, giving appropriate citations of authority. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent supporting paper be published at this point in the RECORD:

treme shortage of prayer books and indispensable religious articles. Synagogues have been forcibly closed down in many cities and towns; the one rabbinical seminary in the country is permitted no more than three or four students.

Third. The anti-Jewish propaganda campaign: This policy is conducted within the charged atmosphere if a virulent press and propaganda campaign against Judaism. In this campaign, Jews are represented in traditional anti-Semitic stereotypes. Judaism as a religion is vilified.

Fourth. The scapegoating of Jews: Jews have been used as scapegoats for the economic ills that plague the country. Of the 195 people sentenced to death for such crimes, at least half, and possibly more, have been Jews.

Fifth. Discrimination in education and employment: The proportion of Jews in higher education, science, and the professions has been declining from 13.5 percent in 1935 to 3.1 percent today. Jews have virtually disappeared from the diplomatic service, and know that they cannot aspire to leading positions in economic, industrial, technical, and engineering work.

Sixth. Refusal of the right to emigrate: Jews who wish to leave the Soviet Union to be reunited with their families are forbidden to do so.

Taken together this adds up to a policy of reducing the Jews to second-class citizenship in the U.S.S.R., of breaking their spirit and crushing their pride. It aims to shatter, pulverize and gradually eliminate Jewish historical consciousness and Jewish identity. It goes beyond the usual form of religious persecution and becomes instead a spiritual strangulation—the deprivation of a people's natural right to know their past and to participate in their present. For without a past and a present, the future is precarious indeed.

Mr. President, Soviet Jews surely have the right to walk in dignity—no less than their fellow citizens of other nationalities and faiths. They are deprived of this right—and the United States, the leader of the free world, has the obligation to protest in the name of human decency. This can be done through enactment by the House and Senate of the resolution I introduce today. I am joined in presenting this resolution by Senators ALLOTT, BARTLETT, BAYH, BENNETT, BOGGS, BREWSTER, BURDICK, BYRD of Virginia, BYRD of West Virginia, CANNON, CASE, CLARK, COOPER, DODD, DOMINICK, DOUGLAS, FANNIN, FONG, GRUENING, HART, HARTKE, HOLLAND, HRUSKA, INOUYE, JACKSON, JAVITS, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, KENNEDY of New York, KUCHEL, LAUSCHE, LONG of Missouri, MAGNUSON, MCCARTHY, MCCLELLAN, MCGEE, MCGOVERN, MCINTYRE, MCNAMARA, METCALF, MILLER, MONDALE, MONRONEY, MONTOYA, MORSE, MORTON, MOSS, MURPHY, NELSON, NEUBERGER, PASTORE, PEARSON, PELL, PROXMIRE, RANDOLPH, SALTONSTALL, SCOTT, SIMPSON, SMATHERS, SMITH, SYMINGTON, THURMOND, TOWER, TYDINGS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of Ohio.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the text of the concurrent resolution at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the text of the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17) to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion, submitted by Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself and other Senators), was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 17

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

Whereas the Congress of the United States deeply believes in freedom of religion for all people and is opposed to infringement of this freedom anywhere in the world; and

Whereas abundant evidence has made clear that the Government of the Soviet Union is persecuting Jewish citizens by singling them out for extreme punishment for alleged economic offenses, by confiscating synagogues, by closing Jewish cemeteries, by arresting rabbis and lay religious leaders, by curtailing religious observances, by discriminating against Jews in cultural activities and access to higher education, by imposing restrictions that prevent the reuniting of Jews with their families in other lands, and by other acts that oppress Jews in the free exercise of their faith; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has a clear opportunity to match the words of its constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion with specific actions so that the world may know whether there is a genuine hope for a new day of better understanding among all people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that persecution of any persons because of their religion by the Soviet Union be condemned, and that the Soviet Union in the name of decency and humanity cease executing persons for alleged economic offenses, and fully permit the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] has submitted a sense-of-Congress resolution protesting the persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union. One single line we must never forget. We learned in Hitler's time that silence will not help the Soviet Jews. Only if the world cries out will the Jews be helped.

The continuing charges of anti-Jewish activities in the Soviet Union should be investigated by the appropriate commissions of the United Nations, the organization established to protect the human rights of people the world over. The U.N. Subcommission for the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities should have the opportunity to examine first hand charges of anti-Semitism in the U.S.S.R.

The suggestion was first made in Geneva last month by Morris B. Abram, president of the American Jewish Committee. It is a good one, for anti-Jewish activities by Government action and policy in the U.S.S.R. have been going on for a long time, contrary to the laws of man, the U.N. Charter, and international morality.

We should explore all possibilities of beaming the spotlight of public disclosure on such acts wherever they occur. Individuals, groups, and, yes, governments in all areas of the free world must continue to give voice to their indignation over anti-Jewish activities. The Hitler madness is all too recent—so is the Stalin "doctor's plot"—not to warn us to speak out in time.

There are about 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union, and they constitute the second largest Jewish community in the world. They are recognized as a nationality, but they are not given the same rights accorded other recognized nationalities in the U.S.S.R. They are denied any form of community organization and are isolated from other Jewish communities throughout the world. But in spite of more than 40 years of persecution and near-persecution, government pressures, and restrictions designed to discourage religious identification, almost 2½ millions in the U.S.S.R. in the 1959 census declared themselves to be Jews.

In spite of Soviet claims of religious freedom and denials of the existence of anti-Semitism because it is a violation of Soviet law, there is ample and grim evidence that the Soviet Government is singling Jews out as a group for discriminatory restrictions and extreme punishment. Jews and the Jewish religion suffer greater limitations and prohibitions at the hands of the Kremlin than any other religious groups in the Soviet Union.

Synagogue buildings and seminaries have been padlocked, Jewish cemeteries have been arbitrarily shut down, and ritual supplies—including matzoth—needed for religious worship cannot be obtained. No Hebrew Bibles or calendars are printed, and prayerbooks are irreplaceable. Means for training rabbis and community workers are inadequate or nonexistent, and unlike other religous groups Jews are not permitted to establish national organizations. Jewish cultural life has been stifled, and the once flourishing Yiddish language literature in books, theater, periodicals, and newspapers has virtually been wiped out.

There is no doubt that the Soviet Union is very sensitive to charges of anti-Semitism and prides itself on the law which makes it a criminal offense. But when 89 out of 163 persons sentenced to death for alleged "black marketing" or economic crimes, are publicly identified as Jews and held up for ridicule, contempt and caricature in the official Soviet press; and when a blatantly anti-Semitic book containing caricatures on the Nazi pattern is published under the title "Judaism Without Embellishment" by the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, authored by one Kichko, and thousands of copies are officially distributed, then it is time to expose the false Soviet claim that there is no anti-Semitism under communism and to denounce the hypocrisy behind the Kremlin's denials of anti-Jewish actions. The crude hatemongering of the Kichko book was even too much for the Communist parties in France, Italy and the United States

to swallow, and they protested, and the intensity of protest from all parts of the world finally persuaded Soviet authorities to suppress the book.

From time to time Soviet leaders have insisted that Soviet treatment of religious minorities is an internal matter and that protests constitute interference in the Soviet Union's domestic affairs. But similar disclaimers by Russia and other nations in earlier periods in our history did not deter the United States from protesting the persecution of Jews or other minority groups.

Since 1840 the United States, while recognizing the principle of nonintervention in the internal affairs of another state, has, nevertheless, protested the persecution of oppressed minorities by foreign governments and has justified these protests in the name of moral duty toward humanity. This policy has remained valid to this day.

This is not the time for silence on the part of American Jewry. Each great wave of indignation will serve to ultimately alleviate, and will help to prevent aggravation of the plight of the Jews in the Soviet Union. Each protest, whether by individuals, by organizations, or by the free nations of the world acting independently or through the United Nations, will serve to make the Kremlin realize how sterile and harmful to its own prestige is its anti-Jewish policy.

I am delighted that many Senators have felt as deeply as I and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] have, and hope they will join in this action. This time I hope this resolution will not go down the drain as a part of the foreign aid bill.

I appeal to the majority leader and to the minority leader—though I do not ask for any assurance at this time—to make this proposal a separate basis of action on the part of the Senate, because last year's action indicates that unless this is done, it will not receive overwhelming support by Members of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 19)

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to House Joint Resolution 234, the joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and I ask that the amendment be printed.

This amendment would restore language placed in the resolution by the other body which curtails export of agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic. I intend to call this amendment up for Senate consideration at the appropriate time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. HOLLAND submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraphs 2 and 4 rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.J. Res. 234) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

Pages 3, on line 7, after the word "Act" insert the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such Act, except when such exports are necessary to carry out the Sales Agreement entered into October 8, 1962, as amended, and if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest."

Mr. HOLLAND also submitted an amendment (No. 20), intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON) submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraphs 2 and 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.J. Res. 234) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 3, at end of line 20, insert the following new section:

"VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

"No funds heretofore appropriated to the Veterans' Administration shall be utilized for the purpose of implementing any order or directive of the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the closing or relocating of any hospital or facility owned or operated by the Veterans' Administration or with respect to the withdrawing, transferring, or reducing of services heretofore made available to veterans."

Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON) also submitted an amendment, No. 21, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. MILLER submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraphs 2 and 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.J. Res. 234) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: Amend the committee amendment as follows:

On page 3: Strike lines 13 and 14 and insert in liew thereof the following: "'or are necessary to carry out any other agreement with the United Arab Republic which has been approved by the Congress.'"

Mr. MILLER also submitted an amendment (No. 22), intended to be proposed by him, to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF SENATE BILL 899

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced Senate bill 899, a bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of America. The name of Senator BOGGS, of Delaware, was inadvertently omitted as a cosponsor and I ask unanimous consent that his name be added on the next printing of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY AND VICE-PRESIDENCY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION TO GRANT CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES WHO HAVE ATTAINED THE AGE OF 18 THE RIGHT TO VOTE IN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent